UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/831,845	04/01/1997	BARTLEY H. CALDER	P2167/SUN1P1	9132

22434   7590   05/09/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/831,845	CALDER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 March 2003_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1.   Applicant is advised that should claim 24 be found allowable, claim 26 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GOSLING (EP 718761 A1) in view of PASHUPATHY (US 6,078,951).

As to claim 1, GOSLING teaches a computer-implemented framework for associating data (object) with a command object (viewer) wherein the data is associated with an application (user interface control program / user's web access program), the computer-implemented framework comprising: a data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program); a data retriever mechanism (objects directory / disc directory or catalog / objects); and a mapping mechanism (viewer library) (pg. 2,

lines 37-44; pg. 4, lines 11-22, pg. 5, lines 24-35; pg. 5, lines 49-58; pg. 6, lines 15-28;

pg. 7, lines 8-9; pg. 24; lines 6-24). However, GOSLING does not explicitly mention that

the data handler mechanism allows use of new command objects without modifying the

application. GOSLING does teach that invention allows object viewers unknown to the

user's web access program to be dynamically used and added to the system in a viewer

library for the user (pg. 2, line 37 – pg. 3, line 11). It would be obvious that this dynamic

loading does not modifying the users web access program since the viewer library is

changed by the addition not the web access program. However, GOSLING does not

teach returning the command list for display.

PASHUPATHY teaches a mapping mechanism (server container) being

arranged to obtain a command list identifying commands (names of viewers) associated

with the data (file type found) and wherein the command list (names of viewers) is

returned for display (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4). It is inherent that the viewers

returned are displayed in a list. It is also obvious based on the combination of

GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is returned to the data

handler mechanism (class loader) then the application (user's web access program) for

display and subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be obvious to

combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in order to

automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for a

computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claim 2, GOSLING teaches the downloading of data and binding such data to a command object (pg. 6, lines 15-28). It would be obvious that since the handle is initially received prior to the body that the data is a stream of bytes over the network.

As to claim 3, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 4, GOSLING teaches the server computer system is a Sun Microsystems computer (pg. 4, line 25). It would be obvious that since the data object and the command object are retrieved from the server computer system and since it is well known in the art that a Sun system is formulated in Java that the data object and command object are created in the Java programming language.

As to claim 5, GOSLING teaches the data is text data (pg. 5, lines 28-35).

As to claim 6, GOSLING teaches the data handler is arranged to receive a request from the application, to bind the data to the command object, and to return the command object to the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 7, lines 8-9).

As to claim 7, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 8, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism includes a look-up table (listing) arranged to associate the command object with the data (pg. 6, lines 22-28).

As to claim 9, GOSLING teaches a computer implemented method for associating data (object) with a command object (viewer) in response to a request from an application (user interface control program / user's web access program), the method comprising: accessing the data through an interface (class loader / inter-computer link control program) in response to the request from the application; accessing a mapping mechanism (viewer library) which is independent of the interface but in communication with the interface to locate a command object that is appropriate for the data; obtaining the command object; binding the command object to the data; and returning the command object to the application (pg. 2, lines 37-44; pg. 4, lines 11-22, pg. 5, lines 24-35; pg. 5, lines 49-58; pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 7, lines 8-9; pg. 24; lines 6-24). However, GOSLING does not explicitly mention that the interface allows use of new command objects without modifying the application. GOSLING does teach that

invention allows object viewers unknown to the user's web access program to be

dynamically used and added to the system in a viewer library for the user (pg. 2, line 37

– pg. 3, line 11). It would be obvious that this dynamic loading does not modifying the

users web access program since the viewer library is changed by the addition not the

web access program. However, GOSLING does not teach returning the command list

for display.

PASHUPATHY teaches obtaining a command list identifying commands (names

of viewers) associated with the data (file type found) and wherein the command list

(names of viewers) is returned for display (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4). It is inherent

that the viewers returned are displayed in a list. It is also obvious based on the

combination of GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is returned to

the data handler mechanism (class loader) then,the application (user's web access

program) for display and subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be

obvious to combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in

order to automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for

a computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claim 10, GOSLING teaches that the two computer systems have different

computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be

obvious that that there would have to exist a mechanism for converting the data from

one format understandable by one platform to another in order for data to be processed

and interpreted for viewing.

As to claim 11, GOSLING teaches the server computer system is a Sun Microsystems computer (pg. 4, line 25). It would be obvious that since the data object and the command object are retrieved from the server computer system and since it is well known in the art that a Sun system is formulated in Java that the data object and command object are created in the Java programming language.

As to claim 12, GOSLING teaches the downloading of data and binding such data to a command object (pg. 6, lines 15-28). It would be obvious that since the handle is initially received prior to the body that the data is a stream of bytes over the network.

As to claim 13, GOSLING teaches operating on the data using the command object (viewing the object) (pg. 7, lines 8-9).

As to claim 14, GOSLING teaches the command object is selected from a set of command objects associated with a command list (listing within the viewer library) and accessing the command list through the interface (pg. 6, lines 22-28).

As to claim 15, PASHUPATHY receiving a request for a command list from the application (check to see if viewer is most current version) obtaining the command list (names of viewers) associated with a type of data (file type found) and wherein the

command list (names of viewers) is returned for display (col. 6, lines 62 – col. 7, line 4). It is inherent that the viewers returned are displayed in a list. It is also obvious based on the combination of GOSLING in view of PASHUPATHY that the command list is returned to the interface (class loader / inter-computer link control program) that performs the cited steps and then the application (user's web access program) for display and subsequent selection by the user. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of GOSLING with the teachings of PASHUPATHY in order to automate the searching, installation, configuration, and updating of software for a computer system (col. 1, line 58-60).

As to claims 16-20, reference is made to a computer program product which corresponds to the method of claims 9-11, 13, and 14 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 9-11, 13, and 14 above. Claim 16 also details the mapping mechanism is not a part of the application. GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism is not part of the application (figures 2 & 3, viewer library is on server also).

As to claim 21, GOSLING teaches the command object (viewer) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer library) based substantially on the data (handle) without an external input from a user of the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 3, lines 1-9).

As to claim 22, GOSLING teaches the command object (viewer) is obtained by the mapping mechanism (viewer library) based substantially on the data (handle) without directly involving the application (pg. 6, lines 15-28; pg. 3, lines 1-9).

As to claim 23, refer to claim 1 for rejection. However, claim 23 further details the data handler mechanism is independent and interfacing with a plurality of applications. GOSLING teaches the client system may be a variety of different computer platforms and a variety of operating systems (pg. 4, lines 27-28). Multitasking operating systems having a executing a plurality of applications are well known in the art and therefore would be obvious in view of the teachings of GOSLING.

As to claim 25, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer library) is not a component of the data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program) (fig 3).

As to claims 24 and 26, GOSLING teaches the mapping mechanism (viewer library) and the data handler mechanism (class loader / inter-computer link control program) are separately maintained (fig 3).

As to claim 27, GOSLING teaches that the client system and the server system are two different computer platforms (pg. 4, lines 23-28). It would be obvious then that the application and class loader are the specific to one another since they are on the

same system while the viewer library is not specific to the application since it is on a

different system.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection to dependent claim 15.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703)

305-0439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00

pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0286.

lab
May 1, 2003